97-84171-11

Cornelius, W.J.J.

What is true temperance?

Peckham

[1921]

97-84171-11
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 270
Cornelius, W. J. J.
What is true temperance? How shall we obtain it in England? A sermon preached at All Saints' Church, North Peckham, by... W.J.J. Cornelius... on Temperance Sunday, Nov. 13th, 1921... Peckham, United Kingdom temperance crusaders [1921]
[8] p. 21 cm.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 10:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 8-28-97 INITIALS: CAB

TRACKING # : 26254

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

What is True Temperance?

How shall we obtain it in England?

A Sermon preached at

ALL SAINTS' CHURCH, NORTH PECKHAM,

by the Vicar,

The Rev. W. J. J. CORNELIUS, M.A., B.D.

on TEMPERANCE SUNDAY,

NOV. 13th, 1921.

308
Z
Box 270

TEXT —St. Luke xi, 26 : "And the last state of that man is worse than the first."

Published by the United Kingdom Temperance Crusaders,
34, Willowbrook Road, Peckham, S.E.15.

President : W. HUCKLE.

Price THREEPENCE.

Reprinted from the SOUTH LONDON PRESS, *November 18, 1921.*

ANTI-PROHIBITION FROM THE PULPIT

Peckham Vicar Condemns All Repressive Legislation.

SOBRIETY BY INFLUENCE.

Rev. W. J. J. Cornelius, Vicar of All Saints', North Peckham, preaching on Sunday — Temperance Sunday — dealt with drunkenness and intemperance in England, his sermon being utterly condemnatory of Prohibition as a remedial measure. Mr. Cornelius put aside, as impossible, any restrictive legislation and advocated as the only way in which success against intemperance was possible, moral persuasion and the education of public opinion, backed up by sensible and wise legislation. The inculcation of consistent and persistent attempts to teach the principles of self-reverence, self-knowledge and self-control would in the end prove the most effective means of promoting true temperance ever yet devised. After public opinion was formed, Mr. Cornelius contended then was the opportunity for State legislation to help, and not to make men and women to be sober, without going against all their most cherished prejudices and causing numbers to smart under a sense of rank injustice and impossible conditions.

NO PROHIBITION.

"I have devoted a large amount of space," Mr. Cornelius continued, "to the consideration of the much-advocated and very drastic reform known as Prohibition. I have been asked by some present to deal with the subject for their personal information, and I am bound to assert, after due consideration of all the facts, that I entirely disagree with this measure as a method of obtaining release from our present unhappy drinking customs. To me, Prohibition savours of the old iron law of the Old Testament, which without the slightest compromise said, 'Do this and thou shalt live,' or 'This is forbidden, if you do it you shall die.' In all the teaching of the New Testament there is the element of persuasion and personal action based on conviction kept to the fore. I have never heard or read of Our Lord forcing his views to be accepted by anyone. Always He set before men and women the higher law of love, and whilst teaching with authority, yet coerced no one to come into line with His ideas and ideals.

"As Christians, His methods should be those advocated and acted upon by us, and there can be no doubt of the ultimate value and successful issues resulting from their operation. Prohibition in our country would, in my opinion, be a tremendous hindrance to the course of true temperance."

The Bishop of Southwark (Dr. Garbett), in his book on "The Church and Modern Problems," stated that "it was doubtful if Prohibition had succeeded in the more thinly-populated districts of the United States; its chance of success in a crowded country like our own would be small and its evasion would be so frequent that the law would be brought into contempt. No Government would survive for a month if in the present state of public opinion it placed a no-licence policy in the forefront of its programme." To this let him add, the preacher continued, that he was in possession of evidence which made it clear that not only in the smaller towns and villages, but also in the great cities, prohibition in the States and elsewhere where it had been made law, had proved detrimental to the advancement of the character and general progress of the people. Not only had it led to more secret drinking, but to increased private production of alcoholic liquor of a deadly composition, and what was worse than all, increased consumption of body and soul-destroying drugs. "No, the solution of our problem does not lie that way, any more than you can root out immorality by a rigid enforcement of marriage on all and sundry."

AMERICAN ARCHBISHOP'S OPINION

Just recently the speaker had received a letter from Archbishop Lloyd, of Chicago, in which he made the following remarks: "Of course we all recognise the complete breakdown of Prohibition over here—and this is acknowledged

April 28, 1930 DA

even by those who were responsible for its passage, the Methodists, co-terminous in a large extent with the Anti-Saloon League. Its direct effects have been to lessen respect for all law, to substitute private breweries and distilleries for the public ones, with the result that since houses are often either one or the other, children of every age are familiarised with how to make it, and how to break the law. This knocks on the head the plea that after a few years of prohibition children and young people will grow away entirely from both the knowledge and use of intoxicants. It has increased crime to an appalling extent, as all our newspapers and publicists agree. Chicago Gaol is fuller than ever before in its history—in fact, large as it is, it is no longer able to house criminality. Do not let anyone from here beguile you in England into believing that in spite of the conditions immediately consequent on the '18th Amendment' by-and-by a generation will grow up ignorant of alcohol and its uses and abuses. This unhappy land is soaked in alcohol to-day, whereas before the 18th Amendment came into being it was merely sprinkled with it, and in such a way as to involve some recognition of law and observance. Now all law is derided and defied."

"A French newspaper," continues the Archbishop, "with a wisdom almost uncanny, attributes a certain unspeakably brutish crime committed in San Francisco recently to our Prohibition Law—we know there is no doubt of it." He proceeds:—"A great friend of mine has just visited cabaret after cabaret in Chicago by night to see for himself the drink customs obtaining there and he states, 'Everywhere I found women intoxicated, and this up to 3 a.m., because they now drink whisky secretly, which before they had not handled. There is now more intoxication in a couple of ounces of whisky than in a bottle of wine or many bottles of beer.' The habitues of cabarets must have something with a 'kick' in it, and that something readiest to hand is whisky, generally horribly adulterated and literally 'fire water.' The bestial crimes so common here to-day are nearly all due to the consumption of moonshine whisky, which is so largely manufactured since the passing of our Prohibition Laws. It is evident that 90 per cent. of the widespread and appalling crime of the States to-day is due to the wanton and law-defying emotions aroused within those who have been forbidden the natural use of intoxicants through the instrumentality of a fanatical and frenzied minority. Prohibition has proved to be unworkable, and the 18th Amendment is doomed. This nation cannot continue to function under such undue pressure. I have suffered much in repute at the hands of prohibitionists for the stand I have taken in my resolve to tell the whole truth about the matter, but I thank God I took such a stand and still hold it."

DRUNKEN CHILDREN.

In support of the statements of the Archbishop regarding children Mr. Cornelius quoted from a paragraph which appeared in the "Daily Mail" of November 4. It was headed "Drunken Children. Boys and Girls Unable to Stand at School Dances." It detailed the conditions under which the prohibition regime works in Atlantic City, U.S.A. Drunkenness among boys and girls attending the high schools there had reached such a pitch that the Government authorities had opened a formal inquiry into the matter. Several of the girls told the investigators that at a dance recently given at one of the local schools, several boys were so drunk that they were unable to stand, and rolled about on the lawn. A mother told the committee that at a Hallowe'en party to which she took her daughter, several boys brought liquor and soon became intoxicated. Another mother said that a girl, who tried to get out of a motor-car on the sea front after a dance, was so drunk that she could not walk. The Public Prosecutor reported that he had received so many complaints of fighting among intoxicated boys at dances that he had been obliged to detail delegates to watch those functions.

It might well be a matter of astonishment, continued the preacher, that in a country that had officially "gone dry" drink could be obtained even by children. But he had quoted the fact that it was privately made in many homes, and in addition, it was being smuggled in to U.S.A. by the shipload. Only a fortnight ago a British whisky ship was captured by the U.S. authorities with a large number of cases of spirit aboard. The vessel was the schooner "S. B. Young," which had for some time been playing a game of hide and seek with the United States revenue cutter off the Massachusetts coast. The schooner's log being examined showed that she had eluded the cutter and that she sailed from Newfoundland for the Bahamas on September 25 with 1,000 cases of whisky, 700 of which she had succeeded in disposing of at different ports. New York was to have had the other 300 cases if seizure had not taken place by the authorities.

UNPARDONABLE.

Dr. Gailor (Episcopal Bishop of Tennessee) said that the Dry Law of the States was "unpardonable." The United Press of San Francisco, September 13, reported that a vigorous attack on the 18th Amendment and the Volstead Act was made by Bishop Gailor (president of the National Executive Council of the Epis-

copal Church), who arrived from Los Angeles. At Salt Lake City he used the following words:—"The amendment regarding prohibition should never have been placed in the constitution. It is an overnight experiment. Such laws as these try to legislate morality into people. It can't be done. The law just shows what a strongly organised minority can do. There is trouble enough in obeying the ten commandments without trying to make an eleventh one of this. I feel like a law-breaker every time I administer the sacrament in my church."

In support of the statement made regarding home brewing and distilling, Mr. Cornelius went on, the "Times" American correspondent, writing on June 3, 1921, stated that the Prohibition Commissioner for the State of Ohio had reported that there were 50,000 stills operating in the State to-day as compared with 100 two years ago. Before the introduction of prohibition, he added, there were not many more than 200 breweries in Ohio, now the number probably ran into hundreds of thousands. The police of the city of Columbus estimated that one family out of every four brews its own beer, and many women were brewing for their own family and their friends as well. Apricots, raisins, and other fruits capable of producing intoxicating cordials were dealt with in huge quantities in grocer's shops, and in some communities 100 per cent. of the homes contained apparatus for making distilled or fermented liquors.

DISASTROUS CONSEQUENCES.

The New York correspondent of "The Times," writing on June 29, quoted a speech made by Dr. W. Wallace Fritz, of Philadelphia (President of the Allied Medical Associations of America), at their annual convention. He declared that the Volstead Enforcement Act had proved a curse to public and country. It was, he added, teaching the public to drink secretly, it was causing gambling and immorality in the homes, it was bringing blindness to scores, and causing those who used to take a nightcap at bedtime to take dope. It had caused a large increase in the sale of narcotic drugs and daily increases the army of dope fiends. It was making imbeciles of many, and before long the asylums for the insane would be overfilled. It was causing diseases of the stomach, liver, kidneys, eyes and heart—all due to the consumption of home brews containing fusel oil, wood alcohol, copper and other deleterious substances. He made the following appeal:—"Are we physicians going to make a stand for public health and for our country, or are we going to sit quietly back and suck our thumbs? We must decide whether prohibition and home brew, or the free use of light wines and beer properly made under Government standards, is the greater evil."

The "New York World," of May 10, 1921, gave a summary of the situation under prohibition. Before prohibition intoxicating liquors were obtainable in saloons, hotels, restaurants and drug stores, but since prohibition they have been found on sale in grocery stores, butchers' shops, barbers' shops, delicatessens, tenement back lots, dry goods' stores, paint shops, soda fountains, private homes, and even in a telephone booth. Certain former saloons and restaurants still supplied them to those whom they know. A few drug stores had been caught selling without prescriptions. More than 3,000 persons, most of whom were law-abiding before prohibition, could never again answer in the negative the question: "Have you ever been arrested"? Police chiefs of smaller cities said that their men could not enforce prohibition, but New York City's police chief said he could—with millions of dollars and a thousand more men. Men of means who want liquor, and drinkers who must have it, were still obtaining it.

IN CANADA.

Let us glance at the effect of prohibition in Canada, the preacher went on. The Council for Social Service of the Church of England in that country, according to the "Church Times," of December 10, 1920, reported on their collection of opinions from the various dioceses respecting the prohibition system. Prohibition has been law over a great part of Canada for four years, and that is thought to be a long enough period to provide an adequate test of the effects of the policy.

Naturally, the reports and opinions are widely divergent. In some places prohibition is declared to be a glorious success, in others a dead failure. Altogether 346 replies were received to the council's questionnaire, and one cannot fail to be struck with the reiterated assertion that prohibition has not stopped drinking, but has, in fact, made drunkards worse, and increased secret drinking among young men; further, gambling seems to be on the increase. Lying, stealing, deceit, evasion of, and contempt for, the law are all regarded as legitimate means of countering State interference with the conscience of the individual. How far the taking of drugs as a substitute for liquor has become habitual it is difficult to say, but official returns of importation of drugs into Canada provide startling figures. In 1912, 35 ounces of cocaine were imported into Canada. Last year the quantity reached 12,333 ounces. Similarly 440 ounces of morphine in 1912 grew in 1919 to 30,087 ounces, and the import of crude opium increased over the same period

from 5,617 pounds to 34,263 pounds. A correspondent in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, says:—"We have in Ontario today the man who drinks perfume, ink, lemon and vanilla extracts, men have been sent to gaol and fined heavily, homes have been deprived of the breadwinner because they have broken an unjust law."

PERSONAL VIEWS.

Lord Northcliffe went to America with an open mind as regarded prohibition, but after what he saw and heard in the States and Canada he said that "Prohibition was only another word for subterfuge of a humiliating and demoralising nature, and a great increase of drunkenness, crime and disease." Professor Stephen Leacock, of the McGill University, Canada, said on September 26, 1921, in the "Liverpool Echo," that when America declared for prohibition it was the worst thing that country ever did. It had turned the people into a nation of spies and informers. It was a terrible thing, and what was more, prohibition did not work. He had been very active against it, and was glad that he had been speaking and writing against it. Those who had seen Dr. Leacock and who had heard him speak would value his emphatic words more than those of some of the other actual eye-witnesses of the effects of prohibition whose utterances were quoted.

IN EUROPE.

What had been the effect of prohibition in Russia? asked Mr. Cornelius. In the "Revue des Deux Mondes" of May 15, there was published the diary of the French Ambassador to Russia during the war. Dated November 21, 1915, M. Paleologue wrote:—"Has not the depression among the illiterate peasants and ignorant moujiks an indirect and unconscious cause, a cause purely physiological—the prohibition of alcohol? One cannot with impunity change by a sudden act the universal diet of a people. The abuse of alcohol was indeed a danger to the physical and moral health of the moujiks; nevertheless, vodka constituted an important factor in their nourishment, the great stimulating food, a food so much the more necessary since the restorative value of the other foods is almost always inferior to their needs. Badly nourished, deprived of their habitual stimulant, the Russian people becomes more and more sensible to depressing emotions. Thus the great reform of August, 1914, so generous in its inspiration, so salutary in its first effects, appears to be turning to the detriment of Russia."

When we examined the conditions in Finland, we found, according to the "Evening Standard," of February 28, 1921, that under prohibition, in the city of Helsingfors in 1920, 12,307 persons were arrested for public drunkenness and 999 persons for other offences against the Prohibition law. Thirty secret distilleries were discovered. If we put the population of Helsingfors at about 130,000, it meant that somewhere about one in every ten of the inhabitants indulged in a drunken bout, or committed some other offence against the prohibition law in 1920.

Prohibition in Norway had had a disastrous effect on that country. The Norwegian correspondent of the "Daily Telegraph" reported on October 30, 1920, as follows:—"As soon as it was realised that prohibition meant more than a passing measure necessary in order to tide over a few critical months of wartime, there broke out an epidemic of clandestine distilling and a frenzied rush commenced to secure any and every sort of substitute for the spirits which were withdrawn from the market. Now, when people are determined to get alcohol, the feat is not difficult, always provided they are not hypercritical as to the quality of the alcohol. To begin with, it is easy enough to contrive a private still which will serve its purpose." Despite all prohibitions and the attendant pains and penalties, drunkenness had not declined; on the contrary it appeared to be definitely on the increase.

In Christiania police statistics showed 4,721 more cases of drunkenness in 1919 than in 1918. Three towns showed higher statistics last year than in 1916, which was a record year for excessive drunkenness. At the port of Drammen there were 559 arrests and fines for drunkenness in 1918; the total rose to 1,783 in 1919—an increase of about 300 per cent."

NORWEGIAN VIEW.

Perhaps one of the most weighty commentaries upon prohibition in Norway had been given in a published interview with Herr Michelsen, who was universally respected as a statesman of far-sighted and independent views, and famous for the leading part he took in conducting the extremely critical negotiations that resulted in Norway's separation from Sweden in 1905. He described the situation produced by the prohibition law in the following terms:—"I consider that the situation brought about by prohibition is a misfortune for the country. It will scarcely promote temperance, and will certainly have a demoralising effect in far wider circles than its champions have ever dreamt. Before prohibition we were well on the way to becoming a sober people. Now the whole is spoilt, at any rate for the immediate future. I have never seen so much drunkenness and demoralisation as in the past year. The explanation appears to be that drunkards always know how to procure the most wretched

substitutes of some kind, and that even people who have hitherto never cared for strongly alcoholic wines now react vigorously against this useless and demoralising policy of compulsion. Private distilling, smuggling, bribery, and other forms of corruption flourish as never before."

WHAT HOME BISHOPS THINK.

As a congregation of Christian people, the preacher continued, they should welcome the statements of some of their Fathers in God on such an important change as that which some advocated with their whole heart and soul. The Bishop of Ripon, speaking at the annual meeting of the Ripon Diocesan Church of England Temperance Society, as reported in the "Guardian" of January 28, 1921, said with respect to the proposal to enforce total abstinence on every citizen in the country:—"You have to prove a great deal to make such a policy possible, and the arguments which I think you can use seem to me to be all at the present time highly disputable. People had not yet reached anything like agreement on the subject. So far as I can see, there is no passage in the whole of the New Testament which quite unmistakeably and directly commends total abstinence, and what is more, the practice of our Lord was of a different kind. It was a great disadvantage to endeavour to achieve a far-reaching reform with a weak spiritual case." Alluding to the argument that even a very small quantity of alcohol impaired efficiency, he said they had, on the other hand, an enormous amount of experience of persons who certainly were not intemperate in the ordinary sense of the word, who used alcoholic liquors, and who continued to do a great quantity of highly efficient work.

The Bishop of Durham (Dr. Hensley Henson), as reported in the "Durham Chronicle," of August, 1921, when dealing with the question of prohibition, said:—"Christianity stands to lose by the success of the crusade for prohibition, for if the English artisan is forced to link together in his mind the profession of Christianity and total abstinence, he will reject both."

May I add to this, added the preacher, a word with regard to the Bishop of Ripon's reference to the New Testament. The Incarnate Son of God took the wine, "which maketh glad the heart of man," and used it in the establishment of a sacrament of such importance that Christians of all time are bidden to celebrate it with such means until the Second Advent. In America to-day there is a likelihood of a great difficulty being raised through prohibition of obtaining wine even for such a sacred purpose as that of celebrating the Holy Communion. A Bill has been introduced into the State Legislature in Colorado which has the support of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, which demands that "all Churches" should surrender the use of wine for sacramental purposes. This has very naturally roused great indignation in all Christian circles, especially as it is impossible to celebrate Holy Communion validly without the use of wine. Well might Cardinal Gibbons says:—"To me it seems strange that after 2,000 years people should pass legislation which strikes at the very root and fundamentals of the Christian religion. There are 20,000 Roman Catholic priests in the United States who every day offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. How can they do this if they cannot obtain wine?" The threat of the organiser of the Methodist prohibitionists (George Waldron) was not forgotten. "The Catholics cannot have wine for this Mass business." And Sidney J. Catts (Governor of Florida), at the Anti-Saloon League's National Convention at Washington, December, 1917, said:—"The man who needs liquor for his religion had better prepare to take his religion out of Florida."

CHRIST'S EXAMPLE.

"Active promoters of prohibition in England to-day, Mr. Cornelius continued, "will, if they are wise, ponder carefully over such proposals and such statements, lest restrictions may one day be proposed in our own land, and it be made impossible to carry out our Lord's command with regard to the one great service which He Himself instituted. Nor may Christian people ever forget that our Lord once attended a marriage feast, and on being told that no wine was forthcoming, did not declare Himself a prohibitionist, but actually converted a large quantity of water into wine for the use of the guests. Again, we cannot set aside as without some interest the fact that St. Paul was no prohibitionist, for in his first letter to St. Timothy he tells him 'to drink no longer water, but use a little wine for his stomach's sake and his often infirmities.'"

The first part of the verse made it clear that the use of wine was not for outward application, as some had actually declared, but for inward comfort and stimulation. It would be interesting to know what members of the Jewish race would do in the event of prohibition becoming law in England, for Jews were never teetotalers. "It is absolutely obligatory for an orthodox Jew to take wine on the Sabbath," stated Rev. Gerald Freidlander (Minister of the Western District Synagogue) in February last, when giving evidence in support of an application before the Justices of the St. James's Division of Westminster for a drink licence for the Kosher restaurant in Wardour-st. Viscount Erleigh, counsel for the applicant, said that it was necessary that a Kosher restaurant should be in a position to supply patrons with Kosher wine. That was the drink of the really orthodox Jew, and made from grapes, it did not differ in strength and make from ordinary wine. Prepared by Jews, no foreign element could be permitted to enter into it, and it must be used at wedding ceremonies and as a beverage at other times." The minister added that he had never heard of a Jew being drunk, nor of a temperance society in connection with the Jewish Church. "We believe the Almighty has given us the good things to enjoy and not to abuse," he remarked.

I have spent some time, Mr. Cornelius added, in setting before you many facts and opinions respecting prohibition as it is being enforced, or rather as it is being evaded in other lands at the present time. Prohibition is, I am convinced, the one way not to help England to free herself from drunkenness and intemperance. It may be able to help in casting one devil out of our land, but the evidence adduced shows that it nearly always aids the introduction of seven or more others. Let us look at our Lord's story from which our text is taken. An unclean spirit, let us call it intemperance, is cast out of a man. He walks through dry places, where prohibition obtains, seeking rest. Not being able to find it, he wishes to return to his former conditions, and he finds that that has been made impossible. He despairs, is angry and abandoned, and caring for no restraint, he takes to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself. They cannot change the emptiness or the uncomfortable state of the house, but they live on in misery, practising all kinds of sin and evil, so that the last state of the man principally concerned is worse than when he was possessed of the one unclean spirit.

It is a peculiar story, but I think one which would have special application to the case of English people, used to liberty, used to freedom, used to being trusted, were prohibition thrust upon them with all its galling chains and grievous bondage. "No," as Bishop Garbett wisely says:—"Its chance of success in a crowded country like our own would be small; and its evasion would be so frequent that the law would be brought into contempt." In a word we should cast out one devil and introduce many others far more degrading and more wicked, if possible, than the one we already have in our midst.

INDIVIDUAL CHOICE.

Total abstinence was excellent, but it must be the result of individual choice, based on cool calculation and mature reflection, undertaken for the force of the example such action presented to the weaker brethren. "It is good," said St. Paul, writing to the Roman assembly, "neither to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." The Apostle was always out to condemn excess, whether it was gluttony or drunkenness or any other evil, yet on the other hand, he taught and practised freedom and liberty in all matters. "May I add a few words of warning to teetotalers with regard to some of the concoctions being resorted to in the place of strong drink. A new beverage has been discovered by the Sugar College of Cuba, according to an article in the 'Evening News' of July 26, 1921. Scientists of the college—which is endowed by the Government—declare that this new drink does not contain a drop of alcohol, nor any substance that would prevent it from obtaining favour from prohibition law. It is made of sugar, but its wildly intoxicating properties depend upon a secret chemical transformation. It is neither beer nor whisky, and contains no 'dope,' but a drop of it makes a person 'frisky,' and a spoonful will make him drunk."

Again, the "Bolton Evening News" issued a warning in its issue of July 11, 1921, against what was becoming quite a favourite drink in England. "Palestine 'bees,' it said, "were the principal ingredient in a decoction known as 'bee wine,' which had led countless teetotal people along an alcoholic path contrary to all their principles and professions." People in thousands of homes were in the habit of drinking "bee wine" ignorant of the fact that a glass of this old-fashioned home-made beverage contained more alcohol than a glass of beer. The habit had become so general that Dr. W. J. Lewis (medical officer to the Pontardawe Council) issued a warning against its use. He described it as "home-made alcohol." Domestic breweries, he said, were to be seen as often in professed teetotalers' houses as in other houses. The fact that it could be produced in unlimited quantities at home, and was sweet and liked by women and children, was sufficient indication of possible dangers. Three men were charged at the Lambeth Police Court last week with being drunk and disorderly at the Elephant and Castle, and they emphatically declared that it was due to some "bee" wine they had consumed.

Let total abstainers be perfectly honest in their practices, and if they give up all strong drink on the ground of expediency and for force of example, be very careful to adhere resolutely to their pledge, and not dabble with any liquor which was of questionable purity, and which might contain much that was evil and harmful to themselves and others.

TRUE TEMPERANCE.

Let me, said the vicar, briefly outline some of the ways in which I believe we

can work for true temperance, the self-control of the Bible. We are out to improve the habits of the people, so that a high and noble character will be formed. And as we are all influenced by our environment, governed in a large degree by the laws and customs of our country, we must make up our minds as to what we are willing to advocate and to back up with regard to the Licensing laws of our land. Bad legislation in this respect leads to increased intemperance; good legislation restrains and lessens it. The Beer Act of 1830, which allowed any ratepayer to open a beer shop, was a disaster in the history of England. "The New Beer Bill," wrote Sydney Smith, a fortnight after it became law, "has begun its operations: everybody is drunk: those who are not singing are sprawling: the sovereign people are in a beastly state." These are telling words and prove how effective unlimited licences act in a bad sense. But, that legislation, when rightly framed with due regard to the increased sobriety of the people, has a beneficial effect is evidenced by the results of the spirit duty of the Budget of 1909, which reduced the consumption of spirits by no less than ten millions of gallons in a year, and this had a further result in the decrease of the number of cases brought before the Courts for drunkenness in England and Scotland. From this we maintain that Parliament has an important part to play in the work of temperance.

Another important temperance move can be made by a great reduction in the number of licensed houses, by shutting up those with bad records and leaving only those with a clean sheet. Such reduction, it will be remembered, was one of the bases on which Mr. Balfour's Act of 1904 was founded. We may not now discuss the matter of compensation in this connection, for that is outside our province. Nor may we hope to deal exhaustively with question regarding clubs, for these again are good or bad, and what is deplorable is the inability to secure a clear conviction against the club of evil tendencies and bad management.

BETTER ENVIRONMENT.

Undoubtedly the provision of better housing, better factories and workshops, the giving of well-authenticated facts and figures in the way of education and the restriction of hours of opening, as well as the encouragement of good amusement and recreation, all will bear their part in the solution of what is one of the most difficult, because so complex, problems ever presented to legislation and people in our land. A perusal of the reports of Brewster Sessions from all parts of the country clearly illustrates that as an aid to true temperance, the idea of public-house reform is steadily gaining ground.

I yield to no one in my desire for the propagation of a policy which shall be wise and well-considered in every way and which shall lead consistently towards the goal of true temperance and the suppression of the disgraceful drunkenness which has in the past marred the beauty of our national life, while at the same time I am anxious not to destroy anyone's liberty and freedom of personal action. God did not intend us to be mere automatons, or machines to be wound up and bound to certain fixed conditions. He intended us to be rational beings, and for this He gave us the endowments of free will, and power of choice, and intelligence to choose the good and resist the evil.

Many will urge that such reasoning will not in any way further the cause which demands the support, active and urgent, of all, and which all right thinking and serious people have at heart, but temperance reform, if it is to be lasting and really progressive, in the best interests of the people generally, must move slowly and deliberately, no new step being taken until the past has been well tried and proved of what sort it is. And the right and proper line throughout is to stir up the public conscience to well consider and then act on this serious matter, which affects the well-being of our nation and people. Rash judgments, ill-considered legislation and undue haste, will cause it to become true in the words of our text, that the last state of that man is worse than the first.

Printed by The South London Press, Ltd. 70-74, London Road, Elephant and Castle, S.E.4.

26254

END OF
TITLE